

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, the specification is objected to based on the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant amends numbered paragraph 23 of the originally filed specification, as indicated herein, and Applicant believes that the Examiner's objection to the specification is obviated.

Claim 1 is also objected to based on the reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 3 on page 2 of the Office Action. Applicant believes that the objection to claim 1 is obviated.

Claims 1-8 are all the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by Greer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,993,722). Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Greer in view of Lambrecht et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,801).

§ 102(e) Rejections (Greer) - Claims 1-6 and 8

Claims 1-6 and 8 are rejected based on the reasons set forth on pages 3-4 of the present Office Action. Applicant traverses these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

Briefly, Greer is directed to a user interface system, method and computer program product which permit selection of predetermined device application modes in a television set system and check the activation status of other application modes. If active modes are identified which are incompatible with the selected active mode, then these other active modes are halted. If compatible active modes are identified, then these remain concurrently active, with particularized adaptations being made. The user interface is particularly adapted for use with a set-top box environment using a TV set as a user display.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Greer does not disclose or suggest at least, "wherein the output mode of the monitor determines whether input commands

from the key input unit will be one of canceled and executed.” Greer only discloses that an application can be terminated once there has been a determination of a resource conflict between two different applications. Further, col. 7, lines 30-34, only discusses that if a game or DVD operation is underway, the associated movie or game may be recognized as being active and may be paused and minimized on the interface display, causing operations to halt. This operation is performed when a television mode is activated by a user. However, there is no teaching or suggestion of the output mode of the monitor determining whether input commands from the key input unit will be canceled or executed. This specific feature is not set forth in Greer, therefore Greer does not anticipate claim 1.

With respect to claim 2, Applicant amends this claim to place it independent form and submits that Greer does not disclose or suggest at least, “wherein the step (c) comprises, if the output mode of the monitor is not a PC mode, canceling input commands from the key input unit,” as recited in amended claim 2. The Examiner cites, *inter alia*, col. 11, line 65 -col. 12, line 15 and col. 7, lines 30-34 as allegedly satisfying the features of claim 2. The teachings of Greer are set forth in the paragraph above. There is no teaching or suggestion of determining whether an output mode of the monitor is not a PC mode, and then canceling input commands from a key input unit. This specific feature is not set forth in Greer, therefore Greer does not anticipate claim 2.

Applicant submits that claim 3 is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 2.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 4-6 and 8 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 2.

§ 103(a) Rejection (Greer/Lambrecht) - Claim 7

Applicant submits that dependent claim 7 is patentable at least by virtue of its indirect dependency from independent claim 1. Lambrecht does not make up for the deficiencies of Greer.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 14, 2007